

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, independent claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 12 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action at page 3, numbered item 3, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over "Related Art" in view of JP 10031683A issued to Haruhiro. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that "when a new keyword is searched for by using a combination of a plurality of upper level keywords, the registration unit generates a lower level category corresponding to the new keyword, and registers the lower level category in a manner to be linked to an upper level category." Applicant respectfully submits that neither the "Related Art" nor Haruhiro teaches or suggests this feature. Independent claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 12 have been similarly amended.

At page 3, the Office Action contends that the "Related Art" teaches "implemented in a client computer a search unit that determines a hierarchical category of an address designated for registration based on a definition entry and a selection record of a menu". "Related Art", Fig. 1, and page 2, lines 26-32 were cited in support of this contention. Additionally, the Office Action contends that "when a new keyword is searched for by using a combination of a plurality of upper level keywords, the registration unit generates a lower level category corresponding to the new keyword", and cites "Related Art" at page 2, lines 18-33 in support of this contention. Applicant, however, respectfully disagrees.

In the "Related Art", a search is carried out using a combination of keywords. When new URL information is obtained, a bookmark corresponding to the URL information is merely disposed on the same hierarchical level in such a manner that they may be regarded as equivalent. The "Related Art" at page 2, lines 18-33, which were relied upon in the Office Action, merely states:

A URL address is normally made up of a plurality of character strings, and needs to be inputted every time an access is made to a homepage. However, while a homepage is being accessed, the bookmark is registered, so that the homepage

can be promptly accessed by simply selecting the URL address from a list of registered bookmarks next time the user makes an access to the homepage.

Referring now to FIGS. 1 to 3B, the processes for searching for a homepage supposedly containing desired information with a search engine and registering the bookmark for the homepage will be described. FIG. 1 is a flowchart of a series of processes for homepage search and bookmark registration. FIGS. 2A to 3B show examples of browser screens displayed on a display unit.

The "Related Art" fails to teach or suggest at least "a search unit that determines a hierarchical category of an address designated for registration based on a definition entry and a selection record of a menu", or that "when a new keyword is searched for by using a combination of a plurality of upper level keywords, the registration unit generates a lower level category corresponding to the new keyword, and registers the lower level category in a manner to be linked to an upper level category", as recited in independent claim 1. Similar features are recited in amended independent claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 12.

At page 3, the Office Action acknowledges that the "Related Art" fails to teach or suggest "a search support device in which an address indicating a location of information accessible on a network is registered; which predetermined search information is used as a keyword for searching for the address indicating a location of desired information accessible on the network." Haruhiro is relied upon to teach this feature. The teachings of Haruhiro, however, fail to cure the deficiencies of the "Related Art" cited above.

As the "Related Art" and Haruhiro, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 12, Applicant respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 12, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12 May 2006

By: Allison Olenginski
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501